

***Village of Barrington  
Architectural Review Commission  
Minutes Summary***

Date: August 25, 2005

Time: 7:00 p.m.

Location: Village Board Room  
200 South Hough Street  
Barrington, Illinois

In Attendance: John Julian III, Chairperson  
Joseph Coath, Vice Chairperson  
Karen Plummer, Commissioner  
Stephen Petersen, Commissioner  
Marty O'Donnell, Commissioner  
Mimi Troy, Commissioner

Staff Members: Paul Evans, Assistant Director of Planning

**Call to Order**

Mr. Julian called the meeting to order at 7:06 p.m. The Roll Call noted the following: John Julian III, present; Joseph Coath, present; Stephen Petersen, present; Karen Plummer, present; Marty O'Donnell, present; Mimi Troy, present; Lisa McCauley, absent. There being a quorum, the meeting proceeded.

**Old Business:**

**ARC 05-06** Lewandowski Residence, 229 West Lincoln Avenue (Public Hearing – Historic)

**Petitioner:** Jim and Noreen Lewandowski, owners

Mr. Julian advised the public of the meeting proceedings and swore in those who wished to speak.

Mr. Lewandowski indicated he had nothing to add to the staff report and his letter to the Commission. They made no presentation and did not present any exhibits.

Ms. Ellen Lindeen, 206 W. Russell Road, began to read a statement regarding the procedures of the Architectural Review Commission (see attached letter).

After about ten minutes, Mr. Julian asked Ms. Lindeen if she would read her statement later in the meeting as her statement did not apply specifically to the Lewandowski case.

No one else from the public wished to speak.

The petitioners are seeking an approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness for an alteration to their property which is located in the H Historic Preservation Overlay District. The petitioners are proposing to modify the existing enclosed porch on the north (front) side of the home and they are also proposing to demolish the existing detached garage and construct a new two-car detached garage.

Mr. Julian asked for staff's comments.

Mr. Evans noted that the ARC initially reviewed this petition at a Public Hearing on July 28, 2005 and the following preliminary recommendations were made:

Front Porch:

1. Opening the front porch was appropriate.
2. Explore using stucco railing for the porch stairs and maintaining the existing concrete stairway.
3. Details of the proposed railings, balustrades and newel posts shall be presented to the ARC for approval.
4. A cut-sheet or photograph of the proposed new front door and picture window shall be presented for ARC approval.
5. If a wood railing system is used the ARC recommends looking at other Craftsman-style homes in the Village for examples of dimensions and detailing.

Detached Garage:

Since the ARC has made a preliminary determination that the detached garaged is a contributing structure, the ARC has recommended against the demolition of the detached garage.

Mr. Julian indicated that the findings from the previous meeting were final findings and not preliminary comments and he asked if any of the Commissioners objected to making the findings from the previous meeting final. There appeared to be general agreement.

Staff, based on the ARC's initial input, the Zoning Ordinance and the 2004/05 historic survey has determined that this petition should be considered a substantial alteration of a contributing structure and therefore must comply with all eleven (11) applicable standards in Section 9.8.G of the Zoning Ordinance.

Based on review of the eleven (11) standards, staff believes that the removal of the windows from the front porch substantially complies with the applicable standards listed in Section 9.8.G of the Zoning Ordinance. Staff believes that the modifications to the structure are appropriate and modest in nature. Staff recommended approval of the request associated with ARC05-06 to remove the windows from the front porch and restore its original appearance.

Regarding the detached garage, staff recommends approval of the demolition of the garage. Staff believes that the adaptive reuse of the existing garage structure is not feasible, given the location and configuration of the garage and in particular, its door openings. Staff believes that if the existing door openings were adequately spaced, adaptive reuse of the structure would be feasible and appropriate. Staff also believes that the proposed new garage meets the requirements of Section 9.8.H (Standards for new construction) and recommends that the ARC make findings for construction of the new garage using these standards.

The ARC discussed whether its previous findings regarding the garage were preliminary or final. It was the consensus of the ARC that the previous findings were final and included an extensive discussion of all the applicable factors.

Mr. Julian asked for the Commission's comments.

Mr. Coath asked the petitioner if pictures of the porch were included in the packet.

Mr. Lewandowski replied they were included but were incorrectly labeled as 209 W. Lincoln instead of 213 W. Lincoln.

Mr. Coath asked if the proposed front door is made of wood.

Mr. Lewandowski replied yes.

Mr. Julian asked what was wrong with the current door.

Mr. Lewandowski replied the door is warped and has been painted over a few times.

The Commission discussed the fact that the proposed door was not a “Craftsman” but rather a “Victorian” door that matched the other existing doors in the house. Because the door would be easy to replace, the Commission decided the proposed door was appropriate. The Commission also agreed the stucco kneewall and cedar caps for the front porch were appropriate.

Mr. Petersen asked if the plans for the proposed garage could be displayed.

Mr. Evans displayed the plan.

Ms. Troy asked for staff to elaborate on their comments regarding the existing garage.

Staff commented that the contributing structure may not be useable and practical for the homeowners.

Mr. O'Donnell asked staff if the ARC would be setting a precedent for all garages, based on the fact that the garage does not meet the needs of the homeowner, if the ARC approves demolition of this garage.

Mr. Julian advised that all petitions and properties are unique and the commission cannot set a precedent. If the Board of trustees overrules the commission, they must find the ARC's decision is in error.

Mr. Julian asked the commission if they were ready to consider a motion. He suggested that the ARC clarify that the previous findings for the demolition of the existing garage were final. The ARC consensus was that the previous findings were final.

*Motion by Ms. Plummer to approve the petition subject to the agreed changes and incorporate ARC's recommendations on the garage door. Mr. Coath seconded the motion.*

Mr. Evans asked if the motion included all of the findings.

Mr. Julian replied yes.

*Ms. Plummer amended the motion to include that if the Board of Trustees overturns ARC's decision regarding the demolition of the garage, the petition for the new garage be sent back to the ARC for further discussion.*

#### *Front Porch:*

1. Opening the front porch is appropriate.
2. Stucco kneewalls with cedar caps can be used for the porch railings as indicated in the 213 W. Lincoln picture. The existing concrete stairway may be replaced by wooden treads and risers.
3. The proposed “Victorian” front door may be used.

#### *Existing Detached Garage:*

##### Demolition of a Contributing Structure in the H Historic District Overlay District

- a. The building is a contributing structure.
- b. The ARC found that demolition of the structure does not substantially comply with the standards in Section 9.8.J of the Barrington Zoning Ordinance (Issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness for Demolition a Contributing Structure) for the following reasons:
  - i. The garage and the site still have physical integrity based on the findings of Commissioner Coath and Commissioner O'Donnell's site inspection on June 16, 2005. The Commissioners found that the garage is a significant contributing structure due to its structural integrity and its unique details and features (i.e., the sliding and folding doors, the shingle siding, and ship-lap sheathing).
  - ii. The streetscape along West Lincoln Avenue would be negatively impacted as the existing garage is visible from the street.

- iii. The loss of the garage, a contributing structure, would negatively impact the Historic District as most of the surrounding structures are contributing.
- iv. The reuse of the existing garage is compatible with the base zoning of the property, which is R-6 Single Family Residential.
- v. If demolition of the existing garage was permitted, the plans for the new detached garage shall be sent back to the ARC for further discussion to ensure they are consistent with the standards set forth in Sections 9.8.G and 9.8.H of the Barrington Zoning Ordinance.
- vi. The existing detached garage is well-maintained and has not suffered from willful neglect.
- vii. The denial of a Certificate of Appropriateness for demolition of the existing garage will not create an economic hardship as defined by Section 9.8.Q of the Barrington Zoning Ordinance.

Roll Call Vote:

Mr. Julian – yes

Mr. Coath – yes

Ms. Plummer - yes

Mr. Petersen - yes

Ms. Troy - yes

Mr. O'Donnell – yes

Motion carried.

**ARC 05-15** Marcan Residence, 516 South Grove Avenue (Public Hearing – Historic)

**Petitioner:** Kenneth Marcan, owner

Motion made by Mr. Petersen to continue ARC 05-15 Marcan Residence to September 8, 2005. Ms. Troy seconded the motion.

*Roll Call Vote:*

Mr. Julian – yes

Mr. Coath – yes

Ms. Plummer - yes

Mr. Petersen - yes

Ms. Troy - yes

Mr. O'Donnell – yes

Motion carried.

**ARC 05-02** Barrington Station, 120-122 S. Northwest Highway (Public Hearing – Non-Historic)

**Petitioner:** GK Development, petitioners

Mr. Allman provided a brief summary of details on the proposed building.

Mr. Julian asked for staff's comments.

Mr. Evans replied that staff approves of the proposed details.

Mr. Petersen asked if a crown is proposed on the rake.

Mr. Allman replied no, but it would be installed.

Mr. Julian asked if the Commission were ready to consider a motion.

*Motion by Mr. Petersen to approve the building details for ARC 05-02 subject to crown proposed on the rake. Mr. O'Donnell seconded the motion.*

*Roll Call Vote:*

Mr. Julian – yes

Mr. Coath – yes

Ms. Plummer - yes

Mr. Petersen - yes

Ms. Troy - yes

Mr. O'Donnell – yes

Motion carried

**ARC 05-13** Bank of America, 500 N. Hough Street (Public Hearing – Non-Historic)

**Petitioner:** Anthony B. Turek, Jones, Lang & LaSalle; Luigi Franceschina, Gensler; petitioner

The petitioner is proposing to build a one-story masonry building with cast stone accents, new lighting, landscaping and signage proposed for the property. The petitioner provided revisions based on previous comments from the Architectural Review Commission.

Mr. Julian asked for staff comment.

Mr. Evans provided comments to the revisions. Staff believes the ARC should make findings regarding the overall design of the building, with particular attention to the architectural style of the building as it relates to the Shops at Flint Creek and other buildings in the Village Center such as overall massing, façade glazing and roof styles. Staff believes that the building has been modified to reflect a more traditional building design and that the roof form, window design, additional landscaping and glazing have helped this building achieve a desired effect. Staff recommends adding higher profile landscaping along the rear (north) façade and the west façade. Staff finds that the building design does conform to the design guidelines listed in the Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Julian asked if the sashes could be a more colorful design.

The petitioner replied that the architect tried to match the sash to the Shops of Flint Creek.

Mr. Coath asked if standard size brick will be used.

The petitioner replied yes.

Mr. Coath asked if the color sample of the awning is subject to the Sign Ordinance.

Mr. Evans replied yes.

Mr. Julian asked that an awning sample be provided to the ARC for approval.

Mr. Berlinghof of Hamilton Partners replied that he would like to make sure that the color of the awning will be approved before the project moves on as this color is Bank of America's signature color.

Mr. Evans replied that the color will have to be checked by staff to make sure it meets the Sign Ordinance code.

Mr. Coath asked if the revised window design could be modified back to its original 3-light design.

The petitioner responded that he misunderstood the ARC's direction on the window and they will provide a modification.

Mr. Julian asked if the Commission were ready to consider a motion.

*Motion by Mr. Petersen to approve ARC 05-13, subject to the ARC's recommendations to the window and cornice details, as well as approval of the awning color. Ms. Troy seconded the motion.*

*Roll Call Vote:*

Mr. Julian – yes

Mr. Coath – yes

Ms. Plummer - yes

Mr. Petersen - yes

Ms. Troy - yes

Mr. O'Donnell – yes

Motion carried.

**New Business:**

**ARC 05-21** Shops at Flint Creek, 500 N. Hough Street (Public Meeting – Non-Historic)

**Petitioners:** Hamilton Partners, owners

The petitioner is requesting final approval to shift the Staples frontage twenty (20) feet to the west. The proposed modification will result in the shifting of one retail space from the west side of the building to the east side of the building. The overall footprint of the south retail building will not change. The project also includes associated landscaping.

Mr. Julian asked if any commissioners had any concerns with the shift. The Commission did not have any concerns with the proposed elevation shift.

*Motion by Mr. Petersen to approve ARC 05-21 to shift Staples twenty (20) feet to the west. Ms. Plummer seconded the motion.*

*Roll Call Vote:*

Mr. Julian – yes

Mr. Coath – yes

Ms. Plummer - yes

Mr. Petersen - yes

Ms. Troy - yes

Mr. O'Donnell – yes

Motion Carried.

**ARC 05-22** Pepper Construction Company, 411 Lake Zurich Road (Public Meeting – Non-Historic)

**Petitioner:** Pepper Construction Company, owner

The petitioner is requesting a Certificate of Approval associated with adding four (4) skylights and nine (9) windows to an existing building as part of an interior building remodel in the O-R Office Research District.

Mr. Julian asked for staff comment.

Mr. Evans replied staff approves of the petition as requested.

Mr. Julian asked if the Commission were ready to consider a motion.

*Motion by Ms. Troy to approve ARC 05-22 as submitted. Mr. Petersen seconded the motion.*

*Roll Call Vote:*

Mr. Julian – yes

Mr. Coath – yes

Ms. Plummer - yes  
Mr. Petersen - yes  
Ms. Troy - yes  
Mr. O'Donnell – yes  
Motion carried.

Ms. Lindeen read a statement on her displeasure with the Architectural Review Commission's process and how they approve petitions. Ms. Lindeen felt that the ARC sets guidelines which are sometimes unreasonable and too expensive for the homeowner to comply with.

Mr. Julian commented that the Architectural Review Commission does not set guidelines. The ARC is required, however, to follow guidelines set by the Village.

Ms. Lindeen commented that many residents are unhappy with the process of the Architectural Review Commission.

Mr. Julian responded that he would encourage residents who have concerns to meet with the Architectural Review Commission to discuss those concerns.

Ms. Lindeen commented that the Village website has not been updated for agendas and minutes and would be helpful when applying for a petition if the application and packet information were available on-line.

Mr. Evans replied that the website and the petition requirement procedures are currently being updated; however, Mr. Evans has encouraged petitioners to meet with the village prior to submitting paperwork because most cases are unique and may not have to submit all the required paperwork.

Mr. O'Donnell agreed with the petitioner that the guidelines are strict; however, he noted that the value of the homes in the historic district is significant due to their historic distinction.

### **Rules for Public Hearing**

Mr. Julian asked if the ARC could meet in September regarding the Rules for Public Meeting.

Mr. Evans replied that would be okay.

### **Planners Report**

Mr. Evans provided information on upcoming cases.

Mr. Petersen commented that the Commission might want to inspect the remodeling of 539 S. Cook Street. The petitioners were approved to make the porch part of the living space; however, they have torn down much more of the original structure. Mr. Petersen asked staff to check whether the petitioners are in violation.

Mr. Coath said he thought Barrington Bank and Trust was to present their final building details for the 201 S. Hough Street building before adding the details to the building. Mr. Evans said he would check the Certificate of Appropriateness to see if that condition existed.

Ms. Plummer commented that she would like to see petitioners present complete packets to the village. She noted her concerns that petitioners have not been submitting complete packets recently.

### **Motion to Adjourn**

Mr. Julian asked if the commission were ready to adjourn.

Motion by Ms. Plummer to adjourn. Mr. O'Donnell seconded the motion. Voice vote noted all ayes. The meeting Adjourned at 9:26 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Paula Emerson  
Recording Secretary

---

John Julian III, Chairperson  
Architectural Review Commission